

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claim 9 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. Claims 14-24 have been cancelled. Claim 25 has been added to further recite applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that this newly added claim is supported by the application as originally filed and that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner restricted prosecution in this application to one of the following groups:

- I. Claims 1-8 drawn to door lock control system;
- II. Claims 9-11, drawn to a method of controlling a lock on a door;
- III. Claims 12 and 13, drawn to a control box; and
- IV. Claims 14-24, drawn to a vibration sensor.

This restriction requirement is respectfully traversed on the ground that the search and examination of all claims, or at least claims 1-11, could be made without a serious burden on the Examiner.

The criteria for restricting claims are set forth in MPEP §803. It provides:

CRITERIA FOR RESTRICTION BETWEEN PATENTABLY DISTINCT INVENTIONS

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

(A) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required. (Internal citations omitted.)

This section further explains the requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case. It provides:

For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be *prima facie* shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation either separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP § 808.02. That *prima facie* showing may be rebutted by appropriate showings or evidence by the applicant.

The elements recited by independent claim 9 follow the elements recited by independent claim 1. In searching for independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that such search will necessarily encompass the invention set forth in claim 9. Since there are fewer than 20 claims pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the examination of all claims, or at least claims 9-11, would not present a significant burden on the Examiner - especially since applicant has cancelled claims 14-24. Accordingly, this requirement is respectfully traversed.

In the event that the Examiner persists in this requirement, applicant elects claims 1-8 along with newly

added claim 25. The elected invention is shown in Fig. 5 and claims 1-8 and 25 encompass the elected invention.

Respectfully Submitted,

November 1, 2006

By: 

Heath W. Hoglund

Reg. No. 41,076

256 Eleanor Roosevelt Street

San Juan, PR 00918

Telephone: 787-772-9200

Faxsimile: 787-772-9533